

RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS

CHENGYAN LIU

ABSTRACT. Through an equivalent condition on the Farey series set forth by Franel [3] and Landau [5], we prove Riemann Hypothesis for the Riemann zeta-function $\zeta(s)$ and the Dirichlet L -function $L(s, \chi)$.

In the memoir [7], Riemann set a stage for investigating the distribution of prime numbers through zeta function

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s},$$

where s a complex number, n an integer, $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$. Augmenting $\zeta(s)$ to the whole plane by analytic continuation, Riemann proved functional equation

$$\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}s} \Gamma\left(\frac{s}{2}\right) \zeta(s) = \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-s)} \Gamma\left(\frac{1-s}{2}\right) \zeta(1-s), \quad (1)$$

where $\Gamma(s) = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-t} t^{s-1} dt$ the Γ function. Through equation (1), we see that $\zeta(s)$ has trivial zeros at the poles of $\Gamma(s/2)$, $s = -2, -4, -6, \dots$. He further suggested the Riemann Hypothesis that all nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ lie on line $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1/2$.

One of its equivalent condition is related to the Farey sequences. Denote r_ν as a Farey fraction, where $r_\nu = h/k$, $0 < h \leq k$, $(h, k) = 1$, $k \leq N$, $1 \leq \nu \leq \Phi(N)$, $\Phi(N) = \varphi(1) + \dots + \varphi(N)$, $\varphi(\nu)$ the Euler function, Franel [3] and Landau [5] proved that the Riemann Hypothesis holds if and only if

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\Phi(N)} |\delta_\nu| = O(N^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}),$$

where $\delta_\nu = r_\nu - \nu/\Phi(N)$, $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrary, is true. Intuitively, if $\nu/\Phi(N)$ falls not far from the corresponding r_ν , we could measure δ_ν by $1/\Phi(N)$. In §1, we will prove

Theorem 1.

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\Phi(N)} |\delta_\nu| = O(N^{\frac{1}{2}} \log N). \quad (2)$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11M26, 11B57; Secondary 11R42.

Prior to Riemann's work, Dirichlet¹ discussed the distribution of primes in a given arithmetic progression $p \equiv a \pmod{q}$, $(a, q) = 1$, through L -function

$$L(s, \chi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\chi(n)}{n^s},$$

where χ a Dirichlet character modulus q , s a complex number, n an integer, $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$. Expanding L -function to the whole plane, for primitive character χ modulus q , we have functional equation² analogous to (1)

$$\left(\frac{\pi}{q}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-s+\sigma_\chi)} \Gamma\left(\frac{1-s+\sigma_\chi}{2}\right) L(s, \bar{\chi}) = \frac{i^{\sigma_\chi} q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\tau(\chi)} \left(\frac{\pi}{q}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(s+\sigma_\chi)} \Gamma\left(\frac{s+\sigma_\chi}{2}\right) L(s, \chi), \quad (3)$$

where $\tau(\chi) = \sum_{m=1}^q \chi(m) \exp(2\pi i m/q)$ the Gaussian sum,

$$\sigma_\chi = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \chi(-1) = 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } \chi(-1) = -1. \end{cases}$$

Through equation (3), we know that L -function has trivial zeros

$$s = \begin{cases} -2, -4, -6, \dots & \text{when } \sigma_\chi = 0, \\ -1, -3, -5, \dots & \text{when } \sigma_\chi = 1. \end{cases}$$

Generalizing the Hypothesis, we would hope that all nontrivial zeros of $L(s, \chi)$ lie on line $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1/2$. In §2, we will prove

Theorem 2. *All nontrivial zeros of $L(s, \chi)$ lie on line $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1/2$.*

The validity of **Theorem 1** implies that

$$\vartheta(x, \chi) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \chi(n) = O(x^{\frac{1}{2}} \log x), \quad (4)$$

where χ a character modulus q , and

$$\frac{1}{L(s, \chi)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n) \chi(n)}{n^s} = s \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\vartheta(t, \chi)}{t^{s+1}} dt. \quad (5)$$

where $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$. Hence, we have **Theorem 2** by analytic continuation.

1. THEOREM 1

Lemma 1.

$$\Phi(N) = \varphi(1) + \dots + \varphi(N) = \frac{3N^2}{\pi^2} + O(N \log N).$$

Proof. This is Theorem 330 of Hardy and Wright [4, p. 268]. $\square$

¹Since his proof for the existence of infinite primes in a given arithmetic progression was (partly) based on his class number formula, Dirichlet assumed real variable s for L -function. See [1, §1–6].

²For its proof, see [1, §9].

Lemma 2.

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} = \log x + \gamma + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right),$$

where γ is Euler constant.

Proof. This is Theorem 442 of Hardy and Wright [4, p. 347]. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1. For large N , denote c_j constant, where $j \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\mathcal{F}_N = \{h/k \mid 0 < h \leq k, k \leq N, (h, k) = 1\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_{Nk} = \{h/k \mid h/k \in \mathcal{F}_N, k \text{ fixed}\}.$$

We build our proof based on following two *Observations*. In the first place, we look at instances when fraction $\nu/\Phi(N)$ is *far away*, in terms of $1/\Phi(N)$, from the corresponding $r_\nu \in \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$. By our instinct, if there is a restraint for such spot, we would have an easy job to evaluate the sum in (2). In the second place, we try to set factor $N^{\frac{1}{2}}$ apart from the rest of terms so that we could get a desired outcome.

Observation a. For a fixed denominator k , we assume that there are λ_1 fractions $\nu_\alpha/\Phi(N)$ corresponding to $r_{\nu_\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$, where $\alpha = \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\lambda_1}$, fall into a k -interval $(j/k, (j+1)/k)$, $1 \leq j \leq k-1$; there are λ_2 Farey fractions $r_{\nu_\beta} \in \mathcal{F}_N$ such that

$$r_{\nu_\beta} \notin \mathcal{F}_{Nk}, \text{ and } r_{\nu_{\alpha_1}} \leq r_{\nu_\beta} \leq r_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1}}},$$

where $\beta = \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{\lambda_2}$; there are λ_3 fractions $\nu_\gamma/\Phi(N)$ corresponding to r_{ν_γ} such that $r_{\nu_\gamma} \notin \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$, $\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1}} \leq \nu_\gamma \leq \nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1+1}}$, $\gamma = \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{\lambda_3}$. Since there is a one on one correspondence between $\nu/\Phi(N)$ and Farey fraction $r_\nu \in \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$, we have

$$\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 1}{\Phi(N)} < \frac{1}{k}, \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{\lambda_1 - 1}{k} < \frac{\lambda_3 - 1}{\Phi(N)}, \quad (7)$$

and

$$(\lambda_1 - 1) \cdot (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 1) < \lambda_3 - 1. \quad (8)$$

Note that on average there are $\Phi(N)/k - \varphi(k)/k$ Farey fractions $r_\nu \notin \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$ fall in a k -interval $(j/k, (j+1)/k)$, $1 \leq j \leq k$, the assumption tells us that k -intervals between $r_{\nu_{\alpha_1}}$ and $r_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1}}}$ are *void*, while k -interval $(r_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1}}}, r_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1+1}}})$ is *abundant* in terms of $r_\nu \notin \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$. Since all $r'_\nu \in \mathcal{F}_{N\iota}$, ι a prime, are equally distributed over $(0, 1)$, the *void* and the *abundant* are caused by $r''_\nu \in \mathcal{F}_{N\kappa}$,

κ a composite number. If $h/m \in \mathcal{F}_N$, $h/m \notin \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$ falls into k -interval $(r_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1}}}, r_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1+1}}})$, but not previous $\lambda_1 - 1$ k -intervals, we have

$$\begin{aligned} mr_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1}}} &\leq h \leq mr_{\nu_{\alpha_{\lambda_1+1}}} , \\ m(\lambda_1 - 1) &\leq k . \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Situation a.1. From equation (9), we know that

$$m < \sqrt{k} , \text{ if } \lambda_1 > \sqrt{k} + 1.$$

According to **Lemma 1**, there are at most $O(k)$ such Farey fractions. Since $k \leq N$, we have

$$(\lambda_1 - 1) \left(\frac{\Phi(N) - \varphi(k)}{k} + o\left(\frac{\Phi(N) - \varphi(k)}{k}\right) \right) - c_1 k \geq \frac{\Phi(N)}{k} .$$

Hence, $\lambda_2 = O(\Phi(N)/k)$, $\lambda_1 = O(1)$ by (6);

Situation a.2. By equation (9), we know that

$$m \leq k/(\lambda_1 - 1) , \text{ if } \lambda_1 \leq \sqrt{k} + 1.$$

There are at most $O(k^2/(\lambda_1 - 1)^2)$ such Farey fractions. However, if $k \leq N^{\frac{2}{3}}$, we have

$$(\lambda_1 - 1) \left(\frac{\Phi(N) - \varphi(k)}{k} + o\left(\frac{\Phi(N) - \varphi(k)}{k}\right) \right) - c_2 \left(\frac{k^2}{(\lambda_1 - 1)^2} \right) \geq \frac{\Phi(N)}{k} .$$

Hence, $\lambda_1 = O(1)$;

Situation a.3. If $\lambda_1 \leq \sqrt{k} + 1$ and $k > N^{\frac{2}{3}}$, we use equation (8). Since

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 1 &= (\lambda_1 - 1) \left(1 + (1 + o)\left(\frac{\Phi(N) - \varphi(k)}{k}\right) - c_3 \left(\frac{k^2}{(\lambda_1 - 1)^3}\right) \right), \\ \lambda_3 - 1 &= (1 + o)\left(\frac{\Phi(N) - \varphi(k)}{k}\right) + c_4 \left(\frac{k^2}{(\lambda_1 - 1)^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

we would get a contradiction if $\lambda_1 = O(k^\eta)$, where $0 < \eta \leq 1/2$. Therefore, $\lambda_1 = O(1)$.

Observation b. For a fixed $k \leq N$, let each k -interval has equal number of Farey fractions, we see that fraction $\nu/\Phi(N)$ would coincide with $r_\nu \in \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$. Hence, only uneven distribution of $r_\nu \notin \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$ might cause $\nu/\Phi(N)$ deviates from

r_ν . We study following cases with consideration of *Observation a*, and

Condition N. There should be no k -interval $(j/k, (j+1)/k)$, $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, $k \leq N$, with negative number of $r_\nu \notin \mathcal{F}_{Nk}$, $r_\nu \in (j/k, (j+1)/k)$.

Case b.1. If $k \leq N^{\frac{3}{4}}$, then $k^2 \leq N^{\frac{3}{2}}$. On average, fraction $\nu/\Phi(N)$ might deviate from the corresponding Farey fraction by $O(N^{\frac{3}{2}}/k)$. By **Lemma 1**, we know that

$$k \frac{1}{\Phi(N)} \cdot c_5 \cdot \frac{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}{k} = \frac{c_6}{N^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{c_6 N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{N} \leq \frac{c_7 N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{k} ;$$

Case b.2. If $k > N^{\frac{3}{4}}$, then on average fraction $\nu/\Phi(N)$ might deviate from the corresponding Farey fraction by $O(k^2/k)$. Applying **Lemma 1**, we know that

$$k \frac{1}{\Phi(N)} \cdot c_8 \cdot k = \frac{c_9 k^2}{N^2} . \quad (10)$$

There exist a number $\varpi_1(k)$ such that $1/\varpi_1(k) < k^2/N^2 < N^{\frac{1}{2}}/\varpi_1(k)$, i.e., $N^2/k^2 < \varpi_1(k) < N^{\frac{5}{2}}/k^2$. Substituting it into equation (10), we have

$$k \frac{1}{\Phi(N)} \cdot c_8 \cdot k \leq \frac{c_{10} N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\varpi_1(k)} ;$$

Case b.3. In an extreme case, if fraction $\nu/\Phi(N)$ deviates from r_ν by $O(k^2)$, we have $k^2 \leq O(\Phi(N)/k)$ by *Condition N*. Therefore, $k \leq O(N^{\frac{2}{3}})$, and

$$k \frac{1}{\Phi(N)} \cdot c_{11} \cdot k^2 = c_{12} \frac{k^3}{N^2} . \quad (11)$$

There exist a number $\varpi_2(k)$ such that $1/\varpi_2(k) < k^3/N^2 < N^{\frac{1}{2}}/\varpi_2(k)$, i.e., $N^2/k^3 < \varpi_2(k) < N^{\frac{5}{2}}/k^3$. Substituting it into equation (11), we have

$$k \frac{1}{\Phi(N)} \cdot c_{11} \cdot k^2 \leq \frac{c_{13} N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\varpi_2(k)} . \quad (12)$$

In general, if there is a function $g(k)$ such that $\nu/\Phi(N)$ deviates from the corresponding Farey fraction by $O(g(k)/k)$, through *Condition N* we have $g(k) \leq O(N^2)$. Subsequently, we could find a corresponding $\varpi_0(k)$ such that $N^2/g(k) < \varpi_0(k) < N^{\frac{5}{2}}/g(k)$, and get an inequality analogous to (12). Summing up these type of inequalities over k , we would have the desired consequence by **Lemma 2**. $\square$

Corollary 1. *All nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ lie on line $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$.*

Proof. By Franel [3], Landau [5] and **Theorem 1**. See also [2, §12.2]. $\square$

Corollary 2.

$$M(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) = O(x^{\frac{1}{2}} \log x) .$$

Proof. By **Theorem 1**. See [2, §12.2, p. 265]. $\square$

2. THEOREM 2

Lemma 3. *Let $u(n)$ and $f(n)$ be arithmetic functions. Define sum function*

$$U(t) = \sum_{n \leq t} u(n) .$$

Let a and b be nonnegative integers with $a < b$. Then

$$\sum_{n=a+1}^b u(n)f(n) = U(b)f(b) - U(a)f(a+1) - \sum_{n=a+1}^{b-1} U(n)(f(n+1) - f(n)) .$$

Let x and y be real numbers such that $0 \leq y < x$. If $f(t)$ is a function with a continuous derivative on the interval $[y, x]$, then

$$\sum_{y < n \leq x} u(n)f(n) = U(x)f(x) - U(y)f(y) - \int_y^x U(t)f'(t)dt .$$

Proof. This is Theorem A. 4 of Nathanson [6, p. 304]. $\square$

Lemma 4. *The estimation (4) is valid.*

Proof. For a principal character χ , we use **Corollary 2**; for a nonprincipal character χ , we use **Lemma 3**. $\square$

Lemma 5. *The equation (5) is valid for $Re(s) > 1$.*

Proof. Through the Euler product³ for $L(s, \chi)$

$$L(s, \chi) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s}\right)^{-1} . \quad (13)$$

where p prime, $Re(s) > 1$, we have the first part of the equation (5). For the second part, using **Lemma 3** we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^x \frac{\mu(n)\chi(n)}{n^s} = \frac{\vartheta(x, \chi)}{x^s} + s \int_1^x \frac{\vartheta(t, \chi)}{t^{s+1}} dt .$$

Let $x \rightarrow \infty$, we get the conclusion. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2. By **Lemma 4**, **Lemma 5** and analytic continuation, we know that $1/L(s, \chi)$ converges for all $Re(s) > 1/2$. Hence, $1/L(s, \chi)$ is analytic for the half-plane $Re(s) > 1/2$. Through functional equation (3), we see that $L(s, \chi)$ is symmetric with respect to $Re(s) = 1/2$ over $(0, 1)$. Therefore, all nontrivial zeros of $L(s, \chi)$ lie on line $Re(s) = 1/2$. $\square$

³See [1, §1].

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980, revised by H. L. Montgomery.
- [2] H. M. Edwards, *Riemann's Zeta Function*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- [3] J. Franel, *Les suites de Farey et le problème des nombres premiers*, Göttinger Nachrichten, (1924), 198–201.
- [4] , G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, 5th ed., Oxford University Press, New York, 1979, reprinted 1994.
- [5] E. Landau, *Bemerkung zu der vorstehenden Arbeit von Herrn Franel*, Göttinger Nachrichten, (1924), 202–206.
- [6] M. B. Nathanson, *Additive Number Theory: The Classical Bases*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [7] B. Riemann, *Über die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter einer Gegebenen GröÙe*, Monatsb. der Berliner Akad., (1858/1960), 671–680.

7003 BROCTON CT., VIRGINIA, VA 22150

E-mail address: `geismn@bigfoot.com`